

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of November 13, 2007 in the above-identified patent application. In that Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leeuwestein in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0134127 to Takeda et al.

At the outset, Applicant expresses his appreciation to the Examiner for the indicated allowability of Claims 4-5, 10-11, 13-14 and 16-17 (subject to these claims being rewritten in independent form).

By this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable Claim 4. Claim 1 has been further amended to place it in substantially the same form as it was considered in the Office Action of June 21, 2006, by deleting claim language that was added to the Claim since the Office Action of June 21, 2006.


Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 is allowable Claim 4 rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action of June 21, 2006 and therefore it is in allowable form. It is further respectfully submitted that Claims 2, 6-9 and 18 depend upon amended Claim 1 and are therefore also in allowable form.

Similarly, by this Amendment, Claim 10 has been amended to remove the dependency on Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 10 is now allowable. Claims 5, 11, 13-14 and 16-17 depend upon Amended Claim 10 and are therefore also allowable.

By this Amendment, Claim 5 has been amended to depend upon Claim 14 and Claims 4 and 15 have been canceled.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of such claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Andrew G. Kolomayets
Reg. No. 33,723

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Attorney for the Applicant

Dated: March 12, 2008